

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076	
25944 . 759	08/13/2004		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			LY, ANH		
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		2172		
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/200-	DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/923,440	MATSUNAGA, HIDEKI				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Anh Ly	2172				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	s Brief must be filed within the pe R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in If the appeal.				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below):				
		300 110 12 30.000),				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the						
issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec		() () () () () () () () () ()				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	<u>t(s) a)</u> will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo	r) 				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		1				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	- Oll Vill				
		ALFÖRD KINDRED PRIMARY EXAMINER				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argued that, "the admitted failure of Van Dyke to teach defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object makes it possible fo Van Dyke to set an iidentifier for identifying an object in association with a retrieval condition for retriing the object." (Page 3, lines 6-8 and lines 15-18).

Van Dyke et al. of 6,412,070 (hereinafter Van Dyke) does not clearly teach a retrival condition for retrieving an object. Van Dyke does teach retriving the security information in the security descriptor or querying a schema of the corresponding object in order to display a lis of all the control access rights that have been defined for that object col. 8, lines 55-67, col. 9, lines 3-30 and line 36-48, alos see fig. 6 and fig. 7). Howvever, Kobajashi et al. of 6,275,825 (hereinafter Kobayashi) teach retrieval condition for retrival an object via anSQL or Select statement, (SELECT, FROM, and WHERE). Data item as object, see fig. 8and fig. 3, col. 4, lines 15-67). The motivation is that to retrieve a requested object based on the definition or condition in the defined access control rights ('070 - col. 8, lines 55-67 and col. 9, lines 1-10).

Applicant argued that, "No text corresponding to the steps of flowchart in Fig. 6 is cited as allegedly disclosing "performming access control for an object matching the retrival condition on the basis of the access right." (Page 3, Ilines 19-21).

In the office action dated 04/07/2004, Examiner does not set the fig. 6 for the above the claim limitation.

Thus, The arguments of applicant are not persuasive.